(Spl. - H.C.A.S. C.D., 78-e)

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET No.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

PANAJI – GOA

APPELLATE SIDE

WRIT PETITION NO. 239 OF 2004

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Quorum appearances, Court's orders, or directions and Registrar's orders.	Court's or Judge's Orders.

Mr. M. S. Sonak, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. V. P. Thali, Senior Central Government Standing Counsel for Respondent No.1.

Mr. Sudesh Usgaonkar, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

Mr. A. N. S. Nadkarni, Advocate General with Mr. N. Takkekar, Additional Government Advocate for Respondent No.3.

CORAM : B. H. MARLAPALLE &
N. A. BRITTO, JJ.

DATE : 15TH SEPTEMBER, 2004.

P.C.

After hearing Mr. M. S. Sonak, learned Counsel for the Petitioner/Society, we deemed it appropriate to see the files pertaining to the award of the subject contract in favour of Respondent No. 3 and accordingly, Mr. Sudesh Usgaonkar,

learned Counsel for Respondent No. 2 placed before us two files, the first one pertained to the Petitioner/Society and the second one is in respect of Respondent No.3.

We are satisfied that the Petitioner's tender could not be considered on account of preliminary deficiencies regarding experience and the value of the contract. At the same time, we are also satisfied that the selection of Respondent No. 3 as the new contractor has been done by assessing its credentials as per the tender terms.

Challenge raised in this Petition is, therefore, devoid of merit and hence, it must be rejected.

Petition is rejected summarily.

B. H. MARLAPALLE, J.

N. A. BRITTO, J

RD.